



Fine-scale population structure and connectivity of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in European waters and implications for conservation

Journal:	<i>Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems</i>
Manuscript ID	AQC-18-0314.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Supplement Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Louis, Marie; Scottish Oceans Institute; Sea Mammal Research Unit; Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chize</p> <p>Nykänen, Milaja; University College Cork School of Biological Earth and Environmental Sciences</p> <p>Dillane, Eileen; University College Cork School of Biological Earth and Environmental Sciences</p> <p>Alfonsi, Eric; Océanopolis; BioGeMME, UFR Sciences et Techniques, Université de Brest</p> <p>Berrow, Simon; Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Department of Life & Physical Sciences Galway, IE; Irish Whale and Dolphin Group</p> <p>O'Brien, Joanne; Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Department of Life & Physical Sciences</p> <p>Brownlow, Andrew; SAC Wildlife Unit</p> <p>Covelo, Pablo; CEMMA (Coordinadora para o Estudo dos Mamíferos Mariños)</p> <p>Dabin, Willy; Observatoire PELAGIS, UMS 3462 CNRS/Université La Rochelle</p> <p>Deaville, Rob; Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London</p> <p>de Stephanis, Renaud; CIRCE, Conservation, Information and Research on Cetaceans; Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana (CSIC)</p> <p>Gally, François; GECC (Groupe d'Etude des Cétacés du Cotentin), Gauffier, Pauline; e) CIRCE (Conservation, Information and Research on Cetaceans), Cabeza de Manzaneda 3, Pelayo, 11390</p> <p>Ingram, Simon; University of Plymouth, School of Marine Science and Engineering</p> <p>Lucas, Tamara; LIENSs (Littoral Environnement et Sociétés), UMR 7266 CNRS/Université de La Rochelle</p> <p>Mirimin, Luca; Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Department of Life & Physical Sciences Galway, IE</p> <p>Penrose, Rod; Marine Environmental Monitoring</p> <p>Rogan, Emer; University of Cork, Zoology, Ecology and Plant Science</p> <p>Silva, Monica; Center of the Institute of Marine Research (IMAR) & Department of Oceanography and Fisheries, University of the Azores; Laboratory of Robotics and Systems in Engineering and Science (LARSyS); Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution</p> <p>Simon-Bouhet, Benoit; Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chize</p>

	Gaggiotti, Oscar; Scottish Oceans Institute
Broad habitat type (mandatory) select 1-2:	coastal < Broad habitat type, ocean < Broad habitat type
General theme or application (mandatory) select 1-2:	genetics < General theme or application, Special Area of Conservation < General theme or application
Broad taxonomic group or category (mandatory, if relevant to paper) select 1-2:	mammals < Broad taxonomic group or category
Impact category (mandatory, if relevant to paper) select 1-2:	



1 Fine-scale population structure and connectivity of bottlenose 2 dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in European waters and implications 3 for conservation

4 Milaja Nykänen^{1*}, Marie Louis^{2,3,4*}, Eileen Dillane¹, Eric Alfonsi^{5,6}, Simon
5 Berrow^{7,8}, Joanne O'Brien^{7,8}, Andrew Brownlow⁹, Pablo Covelo¹⁰, Willy Dabin¹¹,
6 Rob Deaville¹², Renaud de Stephanis^{13,14}, François Gally¹⁵, Pauline Gauffier¹⁴,
7 Simon N. Ingram¹⁶, Tamara Lucas¹⁷, Luca Mirimin⁸, Rod Penrose¹⁸, Emer Rogan¹,
8 Mónica A. Silva^{19,20,21}, Benoit Simon-Bouhet⁴, Oscar E. Gaggiotti²

9
10 *these authors contributed equally

11 Correspondence: Milaja Nykänen: milaja.ny@gmail.com - Marie Louis:
12 marielouis17@hotmail.com

13
14 (1) School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College
15 Cork, North Mall, Cork, Ireland

16 (2) Scottish Oceans Institute, Gatty Marine Laboratory, East Sands, St Andrews
17 KY16 8LB, Scotland, UK

18 (3) Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St Andrews,
19 Gatty Marine Laboratory, East Sands, St Andrews KY16 8LB, Scotland, UK

20 (4) Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé, UMR 7372, Université de La Rochelle,
21 France.

22 (5) Océanopolis, Brest, France.

23 (6) BioGeMME, UFR Sciences et Techniques, Université de Brest, France.

24 (7) Irish Whale and Dolphin Group, Kilrush, Co Clare, Ireland.

25 (8) Marine and Freshwater Research Centre, Department of Natural Sciences,
26 School of Science and Computing, Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Dublin
27 Road, H91 T8NW Galway, Ireland,

28 (9) SAC Wildlife Unit, Inverness, Scotland.

29 (10) CEMMA (Coordinadora para o Estudo dos Mamíferos Mariños), Gondomar,
30 Spain.

(11) *Observatoire PELAGIS, UMS 3462 CNRS/Université La Rochelle, France.*

(12) *Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, England.*

(13) *Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana (CSIC), Sevilla, Spain.*

(14) *CIRCE (Conservation, Information and Research on Cetaceans), Pelayo, Spain.*

(15) *GECC (Groupe d'Etude des Cétacés du Cotentin), Cherbourg-Octeville, France.*

(16) *School of Marine Science and Engineering, Plymouth University, Plymouth PL4 8AA, UK,*

(17) *LIENSs (Littoral Environnement et Sociétés), UMR 7266 CNRS/Université de La Rochelle, France.*

(18) *Marine Environmental Monitoring, Cardigan, Wales, United Kingdom.*

(19) *Center of the Institute of Marine Research (IMAR) & Department of Oceanography and Fisheries, University of the Azores, Horta, Azores, Portugal.*

(20) *Laboratory of Robotics and Systems in Engineering and Science (LARSyS), Lisboa, Portugal.*

(21) *Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, United States of America.*

Abstract

1. Protecting species often involves the designation of protected areas, wherein suitable management strategies are applied either at the taxon or ecosystem level. Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) have been created in European waters under the Habitats Directive to protect bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, which forms two ecotypes, pelagic and coastal.

2. The SACs have been designated in coastal waters based on photo-identification studies that have indicated that bottlenose dolphins have relatively high site fidelity. However, individuals can carry out long-distance movements which suggest potential for demographic connectivity between the SACs as well as with other areas.

3. Connectivity can be studied using genetic markers. Previous studies on the species in this area used different sets of genetic markers and therefore inference on the fine-scale population structure and demographic connectivity has not yet been made at a large scale. A common set of microsatellite markers was used in this study to provide the first comprehensive estimate of genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins in European Atlantic waters.

4. As in previous studies, a high level of genetic differentiation was found between coastal and pelagic populations. Genetic structure was defined at an unprecedented fine-scale level for coastal dolphins leading to identification of five distinct coastal populations inhabiting the following areas: Shannon estuary, west coast of Ireland, English Channel, coastal Galicia, east coast of Scotland, and Wales/West Scotland. Demographic connectivity was very low among most populations with less than 10% migration rate suggesting no demographic coupling among them. Each local population should therefore be monitored separately.

Keywords: coastal, ocean, population genetics, Special Area of Conservation, mammals, bottlenose dolphins

77 **Introduction**

78 Protecting species and their habitats is the goal of conservation biology, and this often
79 includes the designation of protected areas, wherein suitable management strategies
80 are applied either at the taxon or ecosystem level. According to the definition by the
81 World Conservation Union (IUCN), a Marine Protected Area (MPA) is “any area of
82 intertidal or subtidal terrain, together with its overlying water and associated flora,
83 fauna, historical and cultural features, which has been reserved by law or other
84 effective means to protect part or all of the enclosed environment” (Kelleher &
85 Phillips, 1999, 18). The usefulness of static MPAs to preserve biodiversity or to protect
86 a particular species or population has been debated (e.g., Agardy, di Sciara, & Christie,
87 2011; Hartel, Constantine, & Torres, 2015; Hooker & Gerber, 2004; Wilson, 2016),
88 but they remain the primary spatial conservation unit worldwide and are key
89 components of various conservation plans (e.g., the United Nations Plan for
90 Biodiversity (2011–2020), the IUCN Worlds Parks Congress and the European
91 Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (European Commission, 2011)). In European waters, the
92 Member States of the European Union are required to designate Special Areas of
93 Conservation (SACs) for species listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive (European
94 Economic Community, 1992), which includes two cetacean species; the harbour
95 porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena*, and the common bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops*
96 *truncatus*. These SACs, which are part of the European Natura 2000 strategy, should
97 represent areas essential for the species’ life and reproduction. In addition to the
98 protection under the Habitats Directive, as top predators, bottlenose dolphins are
99 considered as one of the indicator species for ‘good environmental status’ (GES) in
100 coastal waters by the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD, Council of the
101 European Communities, 2008). The aim of MSFD is to protect the European marine

102 environment by applying a comprehensive ecosystem-based approach to the
103 management of human activities, and by maintaining or restoring the favourable
104 conservation status of a number of species.

105 Previous research using photo-identification has shown that most coastal bottlenose
106 dolphin populations in Europe comprise between 30 and 400 resident individuals with
107 strong site fidelity to their respective coastal site (e.g., Cheney et al., 2013; Ingram &
108 Rogan, 2002; Louis et al., 2015). However, also based on photo-identification studies,
109 some of these individuals are highly mobile travelling distances of hundreds of
110 kilometres around the UK and Ireland (Cheney et al., 2013; Ingram, Englund, &
111 Rogan, 2001; Ingram & Rogan, 2003; O'Brien et al., 2009; Robinson et al., 2012).
112 Nonetheless, the high site-fidelity and the preferential use of some geographical areas
113 indicate that coastal bottlenose dolphins may be very sensitive to changes in local
114 environmental conditions, ecological factors, or anthropogenic disturbance. The
115 sensitivity of bottlenose dolphins to these threats is exacerbated by their position as an
116 apex predator and also by their low reproductive rates (Connor, Wells, Mann, & Read,
117 2000; Quick et al., 2014). The main threats in coastal environments include pollutants
118 such as xenobiotic chemicals (Jepson et al., 2016; Reif, Schaefer, Bossart, & Fair,
119 2017), reduced prey availability, habitat degradation, disturbance from vessel traffic
120 (Lusseau, Bain, Williams, & Smith, 2009; Pirota, Merchant, Thompson, Barton, &
121 Lusseau, 2015; Williams, Bain, Smith, & Lusseau, 2009), entanglement and incidental
122 bycatch, direct hunting, marine construction and anthropogenic noise (Hammond et
123 al., 2012; Meissner et al., 2015; Pirota et al., 2015). The increased risks of
124 demographic perturbation of dolphin populations due to human activities highlights
125 the need for the design and management of protected areas ensuring that dolphin

126 habitat remains favourable and does not deteriorate. A careful investigation of the
127 population structure and quantification of the genetic and demographic connectivity is
128 also necessary as small isolated populations may require more protection due to their
129 reduced genetic resilience.

130 An important step towards the conservation of bottlenose dolphins was taken under
131 the Habitats Directive by designating SACs across the European North-east Atlantic
132 and Mediterranean coastal waters. These designations were based on photo-
133 identification and habitat use surveys showing long-term site-fidelity (Anon, 2012).

134 Another important step towards their conservation is to evaluate population structure
135 and connectivity of populations between the protected areas as well as with other areas.
136 This is particularly important because of the propensity for some individuals to carry
137 out long-distance movements, which suggests potential demographic connectivity
138 between the populations. It is unclear if such movements can result in migration rates
139 that could lead to correlated population dynamics. There is a paucity of studies
140 assessing the level of migration that will lead to demographic coupling (Waples &
141 Gaggiotti, 2006); a process by which changes in population size in one population are
142 influenced by changes taking place in another population (Hastings, 1993). However,
143 a simulation study by Hastings (1993) indicated that under a simple two-population
144 density-dependent model, a migration rate of 10% or more can lead to coupled
145 dynamics, which would require monitoring the populations as a single
146 management/conservation unit. Thus, a threshold of 10% migration above which two
147 local populations are considered independent management units can be used as an
148 operational criterion to address conservation problems.

149 The most cost-effective approach to evaluate demographic connectivity and fine-scale

1
2
3 150 population subdivision is based on the use of genetic markers and population genetics
4
5 151 principles. Thus, a recent workshop on bottlenose dolphin conservation (December
6
7 152 2016; Ó Cadhla & Marnell, 2017) concluded that one of the main priorities for
8
9 153 implementing the afore-mentioned EU directives for this species was a fine-scale
10
11 154 population genetics analysis of dolphins inhabiting European waters. This will allow
12
13 155 the definition of meaningful management units (MUs), which is essential when setting
14
15 156 up strategies for conservation and monitoring, including the estimation of population
16
17 157 trends and the evaluation of the impacts of anthropogenic activities. Note that in the
18
19 158 past, MUs were frequently defined in genetic terms as genetic management units
20
21 159 (GMUs), following Moritz (1994, 374): “populations with significant divergence of
22
23 160 allele frequencies at nuclear or mitochondrial loci, regardless of the phylogenetic
24
25 161 distinctiveness of the alleles”. However, it is now accepted that MUs comprise
26
27 162 demographically independent populations, thus estimating migration rates forms a
28
29 163 central part of the assessment of suitable MUs (Allendorf, Luikart, & Aitken, 2013;
30
31 164 Palsbøll, Berube, & Allendorf, 2007). Furthermore, the criterion underlying GMUs is
32
33 165 not entirely appropriate from a demographic point of view because migration rates (m)
34
35 166 well below 10% can still lead to an absence of significant allelic differentiation (e.g.,
36
37 167 if local population size is 100, $m > 0.01$ will lead to absence of genetic differentiation;
38
39 168 c.f. Waples & Gaggiotti, 2006). Nevertheless, population genetics principles can be
40
41 169 used to estimate migration rates to implement the 10% migration threshold criterion.
42
43 170 In addition, other measures can be used in order to define MUs, such as ecological
44
45 171 tracers (e.g., Giménez et al., 2018) or analyses of population viability (Olsen et al.,
46
47 172 2014).

1
2
3 173 Previous genetic studies on bottlenose dolphins worldwide have identified a clear
4
5 174 population structuring based on nuclear microsatellites and mitochondrial markers
6
7
8 175 with varying geographical scales (e.g., Allen et al., 2016; Hoelzel, Potter, & Best,
9
10 176 1998; Rosel, Hansen, & Hohn, 2009; Vollmer & Rosel, 2017). The same has been
11
12 177 found in European waters (Gaspari et al., 2015; Louis, Viricel et al., 2014; Mirimin et
13
14 178 al., 2011; Natoli, Peddemors, & Hoelzel, 2003; Nichols et al., 2007; Nykänen et al.,
15
16 179 2018; Quérrouil et al., 2007), and in some areas this structuring is present even between
17
18 180 geographically adjacent populations (e.g., between the Shannon estuary and the rest of
19
20 181 the west coast of Ireland, Mirimin et al., 2011; Nykänen et al., 2018). Recently, Louis,
21
22 182 Viricel et al. (2014) determined that coastal and pelagic bottlenose dolphins in
23
24 183 European waters were genetically and ecologically distinct from each other and that
25
26 184 further structuring within the two ecotypes existed; the coastal ecotype was divided
27
28 185 into the Coastal South population, which included individuals from Normandy and
29
30 186 Galicia, and the Coastal North population, consisting of coastal bottlenose dolphins
31
32 187 around the UK and Ireland. However, these authors did not have sufficient sample
33
34 188 sizes from each local coastal population to fully investigate fine-scale structuring and
35
36 189 no samples were available from the population occupying the Shannon Estuary in
37
38 190 Ireland. Therefore, it remained unclear whether further fine-scale population structure
39
40 191 in coastal waters exists and whether the movement of mobile individuals maintains
41
42 192 connectivity between the local populations. Furthermore, the previous studies on
43
44 193 bottlenose dolphin population structure (Fernandez et al., 2011; Louis, Viricel et al.,
45
46 194 2014; Mirimin et al., 2011; Natoli et al., 2003; Nykänen et al., 2018) have all employed
47
48 195 different sets of microsatellite markers, preventing the comparison between studies,
49
50 196 and thus giving a fragmented vision of population structure. The purpose of this study,
51
52 197 therefore, was to evaluate the population structure of bottlenose dolphins in European
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 198 Atlantic waters at a fine-scale level, including samples from the Shannon Estuary and
4
5 199 a larger number of samples from west of Ireland and using a common set of
6
7 200 microsatellite markers between the studies by Louis, Viricel et al. (2014), Mirimin et
8
9 201 al. (2011) and Nykänen et al. (2018). The demographic dispersal between the
10
11 202 populations was estimated, and the findings are discussed in light of the conservation
12
13
14 203 of the species in European waters.

17 204 **Materials and methods**

18
19
20 205 Ninety-six samples from Nykänen et al. (2018), were genotyped at 14 microsatellites
21
22 206 loci used in Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) (Tut02, Ttr34, Ttr58, Ttr04, Ttr63, Tut01,
23
24 207 Ttr19, Tut05, TtrFF6, Tut09, Ttr11, Ttr48, EV37, TexVet7, see characteristics and
25
26 208 amplification conditions in Table S1 and Supplementary text S2 of Louis, Viricel et
27
28 209 al. (2014). This dataset included 13 samples from Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) which
29
30 210 were known to be duplicates based on their sample ID. Additionally, three samples
31
32 211 previously genotyped in Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) were used as a scale, or controls,
33
34 212 to define allele size. Nine samples from Corsica from Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) were
35
36 213 excluded from this study as they are out of the area of interest. Further two samples
37
38 214 from Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) and two samples from Nykänen et al. (2018), were
39
40 215 excluded as they had less than eight loci genotyped out of 14 loci. The overall dataset
41
42 216 used in the present study thus consists of 425 individuals; 344 samples from Louis,
43
44 217 Viricel et al. (2014) and 81 samples (excluding the 13 duplicate samples) from
45
46 218 Nykänen et al. (2018), with the latter originating mainly from the Shannon and West
47
48 219 Ireland populations. The 425 samples include 228 biopsy samples and 197 samples
49
50 220 from stranded animals.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

221 The biopsy samples were taken in coastal Normandy (English Channel, France,
222 N=90), West Ireland (Connemara-Mayo-Donegal area, N=30), Cork harbour (Ireland,
223 N=4) and Shannon Estuary (Ireland, N=45), offshore Ireland (on the shelf edge, see
224 Figure 1, N=1), the Azores (Portugal, N=19), Gibraltar and Cadiz (Spain, N=39).
225 Fifteen samples of stranded dolphins were matches to photo-identification catalogues
226 of coastal animals from East Scotland (N=10), Normandy (N=2), and the Arcachon
227 estuary (Bay of Biscay, France, N=3). The rest of the stranded animals came from
228 Ireland (N=31), Wales (N=26), Scotland (N=34), France (N=58) and Spain (N=33).
229 The coastal or pelagic origin of all stranded animals was identified using genetic
230 assignments to the same cluster as biopsied individuals (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014).
231 Ecotype assignment was further confirmed for some of the individuals using photo-
232 identification catalogues of known coastal animals as detailed above (N=15), stable
233 isotopes (N=40, Louis, Fontaine et al., 2014) and/or drift prediction models (N=66,
234 Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). For example, all samples of stranded animals from East
235 Scotland were predicted to have died close to shore (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014).
236 Individuals stranded in the English Channel in France were predicted to originate from
237 coastal waters while individuals stranded in the Bay of Biscay were predicted to come
238 both from the shelf and the shelf-edge (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014).

239 *Microsatellite marker quality*

240 The 13 identified duplicate samples between the two studies were used to calculate
241 genotyping error rate by dividing the number of inconsistent genotypes among the
242 duplicates (three) by the total number of genotypes (364 minus six missing genotypes,
243 therefore 358).

244 All individuals were successfully amplified for at least eight loci and there was 1.80%
245 of missing values in the dataset. Microchecker 2.2.3 was used to check for null alleles
246 and scoring errors (Van Oosterhout, Hutchinson, Wills, & Shipley, 2004). Departures
247 from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) and linkage equilibrium were tested using
248 10 000 dememorizations, 1 000 batches and 10 000 iterations per batch in GENEPOP
249 on the web version 4.2 (Raymond & Rousset, 1995; Rousset, 2008). Tests were
250 conducted for the whole dataset and for the finest level of population structure
251 identified by the clustering methods (see below).

252 *Genetic population structure*

253 Population delimitation and assignment of individuals was done using three genetic
254 clustering methods, which were applied to: (i) the full microsatellite dataset (N=425),
255 and (ii) a subset comprising only coastal individuals (N=269). The clustering methods
256 include: two Bayesian methods implemented in STRUCTURE (Pritchard, Stephens,
257 & Donnelly, 2000) and TESS (Durand, Chen, & Francois, 2009) and a multivariate
258 method, Discriminant Analysis of Principal Components (DAPC) (Jombart, Devillard,
259 & Balloux, 2010). TESS was also run considering only the pelagic individuals
260 (N=156). For the coastal dolphins, if any cluster included several sampling locations,
261 TESS was re-run considering only those sampling areas to determine if there was
262 further genetic structuring among them.

263 The three different approaches were used to ensure the robustness of the inferred
264 results, as determining the most likely number of clusters can be challenging (Guillot,
265 Leblois, Coulon, & Frantz, 2009). STRUCTURE assigns individuals to clusters by
266 minimizing HWE and linkage disequilibria (Pritchard et al., 2000). TESS implements
267 a probabilistic model similar to STRUCTURE but is spatially explicit as it incorporates

the geographic coordinates of the sampled individuals as *a priori* information (Durand et al., 2009). In contrast to these two Bayesian approaches that use the full data, DAPC uses genetic similarity to cluster individuals and does not make any population genetic model assumptions, i.e., it does not assume clusters are in HWE (Jombart et al., 2010). TESS was run using the conditional auto-regressive (CAR) admixture model with a burn-in of 20 000 steps followed by 120 000 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) steps. The number of clusters (K) tested varied between two and ten when considering the whole data set and the coastal samples only, and between two and six when analysing the pelagic samples only. In these cases, ten replicate runs for each value of K were performed but six replicates were used in the analyses that excluded closely related individuals. The spatial interaction parameter was left at the default value (0.6) with a linear degree trend. To select the most likely number of clusters, the Deviance Information Criterion (DIC) values were plotted against K and plots of individual membership proportions were examined. Consistency across runs was also checked. STRUCTURE was run using the admixture models with correlated and independent allele frequencies, without *a priori* information. Ten independent runs for number of clusters ranging from one to ten were carried out with a burn-in of 100 000 iterations followed by 500 000 MCMC steps. Convergence of each run was confirmed visually by inspecting the α -parameter and likelihood chains, and the consistency across runs was examined using pophelper (Francis, 2017), a package that implements the functions from software CLUMPP (Jakobsson & Rosenberg, 2007) in R (R Core Team, 2018). If the results between replicate runs differed (a sign of MCMC non-convergence across all runs), STRUCTURE was re-run increasing the number of MCMC steps to 500 000 burn-in followed by 1 000 000 samples. To determine the

most likely K , the likelihood ($L(K)$), the rate of change in the likelihood ($L'(K)$ and $L''(K)$) and ΔK (Evanno, Regnaut, & Goudet, 2005) were calculated and plotted for each K using pophelper (Francis, 2017), and individual membership proportion plots for the run with the highest likelihood were plotted for the most likely values of K , following Pritchard et al., (2000).

The DAPC analysis was performed using the package adegenet 2.1.1 (Jombart, 2008) in R following the recommendations in Jombart (2012). The most likely number of clusters was determined with the K -means method using the decrease in Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) value and, in the absence of an “elbow” (a clear drop followed by a sharp increase) in the BIC curve, by plotting and inspecting the membership proportions for the values of K with the lowest BIC values. Maximum number of clusters tested was set to ten, and the linear discriminant analysis was performed on 80% of the retained principal components. Scatter-plots were produced for varying K . The membership proportion plots were checked for concordance with the number of estimated clusters and whether membership proportions to those clusters were high (>80%).

Results of analyses characterizing population structure presented in the main text are based on TESS because they were the most consistent between runs, and importantly, were more concordant with photo-identification studies (see details in the Results section) than those of the two other genetic clustering methods.

The inclusion of closely related individuals can affect population structure analyses (Anderson & Dunham, 2008). Therefore the Queller and Goodnight's (Queller & Goodnight, 1989) relatedness coefficient (R) was estimated among individuals using COANCESTRY (Wang, 2011) within each population identified by TESS. TESS was

re-run after removing one individual from each pair of individuals showing a relatedness coefficient larger or equal to 0.45 as in Rosel et al. (2009).

Nuclear genetic differentiation and diversity

Genetic differentiation, i.e., pairwise F_{ST} (Weir & Cockerham, 1984) and Jost's D (Jost, 2008), between the populations inferred by TESS, were estimated using the R-package *diveRsity* (Keenan, McGinnity, Cross, Crozier, & Prodöhl, 2013). The level of significance was assessed using 1 000 bootstrap samples. For each population, the mean number of alleles (NA), allelic richness (AR), inbreeding coefficient (F_{IS}), observed heterozygosity (H_o) and expected heterozygosity (H_e), were calculated, also in *diveRsity*. Program CONVERT (Glaubitz, 2004) was used to count private alleles. Diversity indices were also calculated separately for each locus.

Recent migration rates

Recent migration rates (i.e., within the last two generations) between the populations identified by TESS at the finest level of genetic structuring were estimated using BayesAss (Wilson & Rannala, 2003). Following Rannala (2013), preliminary runs were first performed to tune up MCMC parameters ensuring proposal acceptance rates around 30%. Ten runs were performed with a burn-in of 1×10^6 iterations followed by 2×10^7 MCMC iterations and a sampling frequency of 1 000. Trace files were plotted using Tracer (Rambaut & Drummond, 2007) to check for convergence and mixing. Consistency of the results between the runs was also checked.

337 Results

338 The genotyping error rate between the two datasets was 0.0084. Significant departures
339 from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) were detected for loci EV37 and Ttr34 in
340 one population each (Appendix S1). As deviation was significant in only one out of
341 seven populations for each locus, these loci were kept in the analyses. Linkage
342 disequilibrium was not significant for any of the pairwise comparisons within each
343 population. No null alleles or scoring errors were found.

344 *Individual assignment methods*

345 The most likely number of clusters when running TESS on the whole dataset was six.
346 The delimitation of the six clusters (see Figure 2, Appendices S2a and S2b) and the
347 whole data set (i.e., including both coastal and pelagic individuals) is as follows. The
348 first cluster was mainly composed of coastal dolphins from East Scotland (ten of which
349 were identified as resident based on photo-identification catalogue), Wales and a few
350 individuals from West Scotland and Galicia. The second cluster consisted of
351 individuals biopsy sampled in the Connemara-Mayo-Donegal area on the west coast
352 of Ireland (i.e., the West Ireland population). The third cluster included coastal
353 biopsies from the Shannon Estuary and four biopsy samples from dolphins sampled in
354 Cork harbour, Ireland (i.e., the Shannon population). The fourth cluster was composed
355 of coastal dolphins sampled in the English Channel, in particular in the Gulf of Saint-
356 Malo, three stranded dolphins previously photo-identified as part of a small group that
357 used to reside in the Arcachon estuary (Bay of Biscay, France) and a few individuals
358 from Galicia (i.e., the English Channel population). The fifth cluster included stranded
359 samples from the west coasts of the United Kingdom, Ireland, France and northern
360 Spain, and biopsy samples from the Northeast Atlantic and around the Azores (*i.e.* the

1
2
3 361 Pelagic Atlantic population). The last cluster was composed of individuals sampled in
4
5 362 the Strait of Gibraltar and the Gulf of Cadiz (i.e., the Gibraltar-Cadiz population).
6
7 363 When considering $K=2$, populations (e) and (f) (in Figure 2), were grouped together in
8
9 364 one cluster and all remaining populations in the other (TESS, results not shown). This
10
11 365 result highlights the hierarchical structuring of the species into coastal (populations (a)
12
13 366 to (d)) and pelagic (populations (e) and (f)). Indeed, populations (e) and (f) consist of
14
15 367 biopsies from individuals sampled in deep waters of the Azores, North Atlantic and
16
17 368 Strait of Gibraltar (plus some samples from the Gulf of Cadiz) as well as samples from
18
19 369 stranded animals from the West coasts of Scotland, Ireland, France and Spain.
20
21
22
23
24 370 In order to study in more detail the structuring among the coastal individuals, TESS
25
26 371 was re-run with coastal samples only. In this case, the most likely number of clusters
27
28 372 was five (Figure 3A). The DIC plot indicated a plateau at $K=5$ or $K=6$ (Appendix S3a)
29
30 373 but examination of membership proportions indicated that there were actually only
31
32 374 five clusters in all of the replicate runs with $K=6$ (Figure 3A, Appendix S3b). Thus,
33
34 375 this finer scale analysis uncovered an additional cluster among the coastal dolphins.
35
36 376 More precisely, the cluster comprising individuals sampled in Scotland, Wales and
37
38 377 Galicia (Figure 2a) was divided into two clusters: one comprising individuals from
39
40 378 Scotland and Wales (Figure 3A(a)) and another including individuals from Galicia
41
42 379 (i.e., the Galicia population, Figure 3A(e)). All remaining coastal individuals (Figure
43
44 380 2b-d) were clustered as before (see Figure 3A(b-d)).
45
46
47
48
49
50 381 To further explore fine-scale structuring, TESS was re-run for only the individuals of
51
52 382 the Scotland–Wales cluster (Figure 3A(a)), as this population encompassed several
53
54 383 geographical areas. Further population structure was found within this area (see Figure
55
56 384 3B and Appendices S4a and S4b) with the first cluster including individuals from
57
58
59
60

385 Wales and a few individuals from West Scotland (Wales–West Scotland population,
386 Figure 3B(a)) and a second cluster consisting of individuals from East Scotland (East
387 Scotland population, Figure 3B(b)).

388 When running TESS on the pelagic samples only, no further genetic structuring was
389 found but the best number of clusters was two, corresponding to the Pelagic Atlantic
390 and the Gibraltar-Cadiz populations (Appendices S5a and S5b), inspection of the
391 admixture plots for $K=2$ to $K=6$ also indicated that there were only two clusters, results
392 shown for $K=2$ and $K=3$ in S5b.

393 Additional analyses with STRUCTURE and DAPC provide general support for TESS
394 results but were either less stable due to convergence problems (STRUCTURE) or
395 were not completely congruent with results of photo-identification studies. When all
396 samples ($N=425$) were included in STRUCTURE runs, the Evanno-method (ΔK ,
397 Evanno et al., 2005) detected only the uppermost hierarchical structure i.e., the
398 division into coastal and pelagic at $K=2$ (Appendix S9d). Nevertheless, using the $L(K)$
399 criterion proposed by Pritchard et al. (2000), the most likely K was six (Appendix S9a),
400 in concordance with TESS. Beyond this, no new genetic clusters emerged in the
401 membership proportion plots (Appendix S10). The full description of STRUCTURE
402 results when including all samples and only the coastal samples is given in Appendices
403 S7 and S11, respectively. In contrast to TESS, STRUCTURE could not detect the
404 samples from Galicia as a separate cluster when only coastal samples were included.

405 When all samples were included in the DAPC analyses, the best number of clusters
406 was found at $K=6$ (Appendices S15-S16). The clusters were almost identical to those
407 found with TESS and STRUCTURE, dividing the Irish samples into Shannon and
408 West coast populations and separating the biopsy samples from Cadiz-Gibraltar from

the Azores biopsies and stranded samples thought to be from a pelagic origin. However, in contrast to TESS, DAPC also failed to delineate the samples from Galicia into a separate cluster when only coastal samples were included. The full description of results when including only the coastal samples is given in Appendix S17.

As mentioned previously (Methods), the inclusion of closely related individuals can bias results of genetic clustering methods. The presence of related individuals varied among the geographic areas considered in this study. They were almost inexistent among pelagic samples as no closely related individuals (with a relatedness coefficient of ≥ 0.45) were found in the Gibraltar-Cadiz population and only three pairs were found in the pelagic Atlantic population. In contrast, relatedness among coastal individuals varied from 1.15% in the English Channel population to 5.13% in the Galicia population. Therefore, TESS was re-run for the coastal populations only taking out one individual from each close kin pair ($N=79$). The results were similar to the runs including close relatives and also indicated five clusters corresponding to the Shannon, the West Ireland, the English Channel, the East and West Scotland–Wales and the Galicia populations (Appendices S6a and S6b). As the results with and without including close relatives were similar, we conclude that the results from TESS presented in Figures 2 and 3 are highly reliable and can be used to draw inferences on migration rates.

Results from genetic clustering methods such as TESS can be used as a first approach to study migration. More precisely, individuals assigned to a population different from the geographical area where they were sampled can be considered as likely migrants. One individual sampled in Galicia had a high assignment probability to the English Channel population (0.75), another individual sampled in the English Channel was

433 assigned to the West Ireland population (with 0.86 probability) and a third individual
434 sampled in the Shannon estuary was assigned to the West Ireland population (with
435 0.77 probability). These results suggest that there is some connectivity between
436 dolphin populations and further analyses with BayesAss are warranted.

437 *Nuclear genetic differentiation and diversity*

438 All nuclear F_{ST} and Jost's D pairwise comparisons between the eight populations
439 identified with TESS were significant. The highest level of differentiation was between
440 pelagic and coastal populations (Table 1). When considering F_{ST} , the lowest level of
441 differentiation was detected between the two pelagic populations. In terms of Jost's D
442 the lowest differentiation was between Wales and East Scotland. The Shannon
443 population was the most differentiated from the pelagic populations followed by the
444 West Ireland population for both indices.

445 Nuclear genetic diversity (Allele Richness (AR) and Observed Heterozygosity (H_o))
446 was significantly lower in most coastal populations than in the pelagic populations,
447 with Kruskal-Wallis $P < 0.01$ in all AR coastal-pelagic comparisons except between
448 English Channel and Gibraltar-Cadiz ($P = 0.07$), and $P < 0.05$ in all H_o comparisons
449 except between Gibraltar-Cadiz and English Channel ($P = 0.12$), Gibraltar-Cadiz and
450 Galicia ($P = 0.18$) and Pelagic Atlantic and Galicia ($P = 0.09$) (Table 2, Appendix S20
451 for values per loci per populations). Among the coastal populations, allele richness
452 was highest in the English Channel population and lowest in the Shannon population,
453 between which the difference was significant (Kruskal-Wallis $P < 0.05$). The highest
454 number of private alleles was found in the pelagic Atlantic population ($N = 26$), two
455 private alleles were found in the Gibraltar/Cadiz and the English Channel populations
456 and one private allele in the East Scotland and in the West Scotland–Wales

457 populations. A significant heterozygote deficiency was detected in the Shannon, West
458 Ireland and Galicia populations (Table 2).

459 *Recent migration rates*

460 Estimates of recent migration rates were highly consistent between runs; therefore, the
461 results presented here are based on a randomly chosen run (Table 3). Estimated
462 migration rates were very low between most populations, around <1% per generation,
463 with an upper bound for the 95% credibility interval of less than 10% and a lower
464 bound of 0 (Table 3). The only exceptions were mean migration rate of 18.1% between
465 Galicia and East Scotland, and mean rate of 25.7% from East Scotland to Wales–West
466 Scotland. However, these higher migration rates need to be interpreted with caution as
467 individuals from Scotland, Wales and Galicia consisted of stranded animals. As
468 mentioned before, although a portion of the East Scotland individuals were matched
469 to photo-identification catalogues of known coastal animals, there is uncertainty about
470 the origin of strandings in Wales and West Scotland.

472 **Discussion**

473 This study presents, to date, the most comprehensive analysis of the genetic structure
474 of bottlenose dolphins in the North-east Atlantic as it includes samples collected from
475 an unprecedentedly wide geographical area, which unlike previous studies, were
476 analysed using a common set of microsatellite markers. The results of this study,
477 therefore, have the potential to be used to identify management units in this area and
478 thus offer a significant contribution to the conservation of the species in European
479 waters.

1
2
3 480 A first level of genetic differentiation was found between coastal and pelagic
4
5 481 populations, as in a previous study (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). The results from TESS
6
7 482 in terms of assignments to coastal and pelagic ecotypes were identical to that of Louis,
8
9 483 Viricel et al. (2014) with only one exception. One individual that stranded in the Bay
10
11 484 of Biscay which belonged to the Pelagic Mediterranean population in Louis, Viricel et
12
13 485 al. (2014) clustered with the coastal English Channel population in this study. No
14
15 486 further genetic structure was found within the two pelagic populations (i.e., Pelagic
16
17 487 Atlantic and Gibraltar-Cadiz).

18
19
20
21
22 488 Fine-scale population structure among coastal bottlenose dolphins from different
23
24 489 geographical locations corresponded to the different local populations that inhabit the
25
26 490 Shannon estuary, west of Ireland, the English Channel, Galicia, East Scotland, and
27
28 491 Wales/West Scotland. Previous studies only identified large-scale population structure
29
30 492 in coastal waters due to uneven sampling of each local coastal population (Louis,
31
32 493 Viricel et al., 2014) or fine-scale population structure in small geographic regions
33
34 494 (Fernandez et al., 2011; Mirimin et al., 2011, Nykänen et al., 2018). Thus, the results
35
36 495 of this study highlight the need for and the power of broad scale collaboration when
37
38 496 working on the conservation of highly mobile species that can move across national
39
40 497 borders. The level of resolution was only possible thanks to broad international
41
42 498 collaborations, sample sharing and careful calibration of allele scoring to overcome
43
44 499 the difficulties of comparing genotypes across studies.

45
46
47
48
49
50 500 Although results of all three genetic clustering methods were generally consistent, their
51
52 501 comparison with independent results from photo-identification studies highlighted
53
54 502 differences in performance among them. More explicitly, the coastal population
55
56 503 assignments inferred with TESS were concordant with photo-identification studies

1
2
3 504 indicating geographically isolated populations with site fidelity. This was not always
4
5 505 the case for STRUCTURE and DAPC results. This highlights the power of clustering
6
7 506 methods using *a priori* spatial information to infer complex population structure.
8
9
10 507 Indeed, although STRUCTURE was able to identify the same six clusters as TESS
11
12 508 when all samples were considered, it was unable to identify further fine-scale
13
14 509 structuring among coastal samples. Comparing the two approaches to infer the number
15
16 510 of clusters using STRUCTURE, supports the idea that Evanno's method is well
17
18 511 adapted to identify the first level of structuring under hierarchical scenarios (Waples
19
20 512 & Gaggiotti 2006) such as those observed in bottlenose dolphins. DAPC also supports
21
22 513 the subdivision of bottlenose dolphins into six management units but assignment of
23
24 514 individuals to populations was less consistent with those of the two other methods. In
25
26 515 particular, one of the genetic clusters was composed of individuals sampled from many
27
28 516 different geographic locations. As Jombart et al. (2010) indicate, DAPC uses a purely
29
30 517 statistical criterion aimed at identifying the minimum number of groups that best
31
32 518 explain total observed variation while at the same time maximising between group
33
34 519 variation. Thus, as opposed to TESS and STRUCTURE, it does not take into
35
36 520 consideration Hardy-Weinberg and linkage equilibrium, which explains the observed
37
38 521 differences with the two other methods in the individual assignments to populations.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 522 The use of stranded animals could be considered as a limitation of this study. However,
46
47 523 we are relatively confident in the inferences made, even though strandings constitute
48
49 524 almost half of all samples. Firstly, a drift-prediction model (Peltier et al., 2012) was
50
51 525 applied in a previous study (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014), to estimate the most likely area
52
53 526 of death. The estimated origin with the drift prediction model was consistent with the
54
55 527 genetic results separating coastal and pelagic bottlenose dolphins (Louis, Viricel et al.,
56
57
58
59
60

2014). For example, in East Scotland, all individuals were estimated to have died very close to shore. The coastal and pelagic assignments of a subset of the samples were confirmed using stable isotopes (Louis, Fontaine et al., 2014). In addition, 15 stranded animals were known to be part of the resident coastal populations and their genetic assignments matched photo-identification studies (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). Nevertheless, we acknowledge that there is uncertainty in the origin of the stranded animals when there is no further evidence such as photo-identification and drift modelling. This is the case for the coastal populations of Galicia and Wales/West Scotland and caution is therefore required when interpreting these results.

The fine-scale population structure likely results from natal philopatry, possibly driven by vertically (mother to offspring) and horizontally (between non-filial conspecifics) learned foraging behaviours during the juvenile life stage, site fidelity and social structure (Foote et al., 2016; Kopps et al., 2014; Whitehead, 2017; see further discussion in Louis, Viricel et al., 2014; Louis, Fontaine et al., 2014; Nykänen et al., 2018). Photo-identification studies indicated site fidelity to relatively restricted geographical areas (Cheney et al., 2014; Ingram & Rogan, 2002; Louis et al., 2015), however, individuals can undertake movements of a few hundreds of kilometres, i.e., around Ireland (O'Brien et al., 2009) and the East coast of Scotland (Cheney et al., 2013) but these movements can still be considered occurring at a relatively small scale. There is also some evidence of larger scale movements between the North Sea and the Atlantic, as reported in Robinson et al. (2012), and this provides further potential for genetic and demographic connectivity between the populations; seven transient dolphins were first sighted in the Moray Firth, East Scotland and later re-sighted in the Hebrides, West Scotland. Five of these animals were later recorded in coastal Irish

552 waters and some of these movements represent travelled distances of over 1 200 km
553 (Robinson et al., 2012). These individuals are believed to be part of the West Ireland
554 population based on photo-identification catalogue kept on the coastal Irish dolphins.
555 However, photo-identification fieldwork mainly occurs during the summer in most
556 areas. Therefore, movements outside this season may be overlooked.

557 Despite the above-mentioned movements, our results are consistent with a very low
558 degree of connectivity among the studied populations. In other words, the different
559 populations are relatively isolated from each other. Estimated migration rates among
560 populations were very low, and less than 1% per generation for most of the pairwise
561 comparisons. Although there is no consensus on the level of migration that leads to
562 demographic coupling (Waples & Gaggiotti, 2006; Palsboll et al., 2007), the estimated
563 migration rates are well below the rate of 10%, which according to a simulation study
564 can lead to coupled dynamics (Hastings, 1993). Demographic connectivity is therefore
565 very low among local populations. The only exceptions are the migration rates of 18%
566 from East Scotland to Galicia and 26% from East Scotland to Wales, the latter of which
567 could be explained by the relatively short distance between the two sites. However, as
568 these populations included only stranded dolphins and although all the East Scotland
569 samples were estimated to originate from the North Sea according to a drift-prediction
570 model used in a previous study (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014), there is some uncertainty
571 about the origin of the individuals sampled in Wales and Galicia. As migration rate
572 estimates have been shown to be dependent on the number of clusters chosen to best
573 represent the population structure and thus the number of individuals in each cluster
574 (Olsen et al., 2014), great care has to be taken that the sampling strategy used is robust
575 and the samples are representative of each population. The present study is based on

576 the most comprehensive set of genetic samples available but there is still a need for
577 more biopsy samples from Wales and Scotland to further support our results.

578

579 The different populations were characterised in terms of genetic diversity,
580 differentiation and migration rates. This information and existing estimates of
581 abundance will help to evaluate the conservation status and vulnerability of the
582 populations. Indeed, small isolated population are at risk of losing heterozygosity and
583 genetic resilience due to genetic drift (Lacy, 1987) and are thus more vulnerable to
584 stochastic environmental changes or anthropogenic stressors than larger populations.
585 Genetic diversity was higher in the pelagic populations than coastal populations as in
586 previous studies (Hoelzel et al., 1998; Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). This is consistent
587 with higher abundance of the pelagic populations compared to the coastal populations.
588 The Gibraltar-Cadiz population included around 700 photo-identified individuals
589 (Giménez et al., 2018) and the Pelagic Atlantic abundance estimates (from Scotland to
590 Spain) are several tens of thousands of individuals (Hammond et al., 2013, 2009) while
591 the abundances of coastal dolphins do not exceed ~400 individuals (see below).

592 Genetic diversity indices for the coastal populations were concordant with abundance
593 estimates using mark-recapture methods. The population of the English Channel,
594 which is the largest coastal population with abundance estimates of around 400
595 individuals (Louis et al., 2015), had the highest genetic diversity. The Shannon
596 population had the lowest genetic diversity and is the smallest with abundance
597 estimated between 110 and 140 dolphins (Berrow, 2012; Englund, Ingram, & Rogan,
598 2008; Ingram & Rogan, 2002, 2003; Rogan, Gkarakouni, Nykänen, Whitaker, &
599 Ingram, 2018). Abundance estimates were around 200 individuals in East Scotland

600 (Cheney et al., 2013), ca. 190 for the West Irish population (Nykänen, 2016) and 150
601 to 250 individuals in Wales (Pesante, Evans, Baines, & McMath, 2008). Any local
602 perturbation or global change could thus have drastic negative effects on these coastal
603 populations due to their small size, low genetic diversity and low connectivity
604 uncovered in this study.

605 This study filled a major knowledge gap on the fine-scale population structure of
606 bottlenose dolphins in European Atlantic waters, which was considered as the main
607 research priority for the protection of this species (Ó Cadhla & Marnell, 2017). As
608 previously found in Louis, Viricel et al. (2014), coastal and pelagic populations are
609 distinct and should be monitored separately. In terms of the coastal populations, the
610 high genetic differentiation and negligible migration rates found in this study highlight
611 the need to separately monitor each local population (the English Channel, the
612 Shannon, the West Ireland, the East Scotland, the Galicia and the Wales–West
613 Scotland populations) as they correspond to different management units. However, we
614 cannot rule out further fine-scale population division in Wales and West Scotland due
615 to the small sample sizes (N=16 and N=5, respectively), and the fact that all came from
616 stranded dolphins as the use of samples of stranded animals only may lead to under-
617 estimated population structure (Bilgmann, Möller, Harcourt, Kemper, & Beheregaray,
618 2011).

619 The small population sizes of the coastal populations and their isolation may render
620 them vulnerable to anthropogenic impacts. These results highlight the need to protect
621 their habitat through protected areas such as the SACs where anthropogenic activities
622 are appropriately managed, ensuring their ecological suitability to the populations
623 utilizing them. Regular monitoring of population dynamics (e.g., abundance, survival,

calving rate) using photo-identification, as undertaken in some of the areas, is therefore recommended to evaluate population trends. Population viability analyses, as applied to harbour seals, *Phoca vitulina*, in Southern Scandinavia in Olsen et al. (2014), could also help inform whether the populations are of sufficient size for long-term population viability in the absence of immigration.

In this study, management units were identified by first clustering individuals into putative populations based on individuals' genotypes and then by estimating their connectivity. Populations not sampled in this study (i.e., the Sado Estuary, Portugal, and the Iroise Sea, France) could be genotyped in the future using the same set of markers as in this study to further clarify their connectivity with the other European Atlantic populations. The Atlantic pelagic population showed no genetic differentiation over a large geographical range from West Scotland to the Azores. However, pelagic bottlenose dolphin populations may show ecological differences even in the absence of genetic divergence and this should be considered when allocating management units. For example, the bottlenose dolphins of the Gibraltar Strait and of the Gulf of Cadiz, although potentially presenting no genetic structure, showed differences in ecology detected using different ecological tracers (i.e., stable isotopes and contaminant loads) and individual monitoring through photo-identification, leading to the delineation of two ecological, management units (Giménez et al., 2018). This type of ecological differentiation may be detected using next generation sequencing data covering the whole genome of the species, which would allow testing for adaptive differentiation (Funk, McKay, Hohenlohe, & Allendorf, 2012). We recommend combining genetic data with ecological data (e.g., the use of stable isotopes) and individual monitoring, where available, to determine

We thank Andrew Foote for advice and comments, Amélia Viricel, H  l  ne Peltier and Christophe Guinet for their help during ML’s PhD study. We also thank everyone involved in data collection: Conor Ryan (GMIT, IWDG), Nigel Monaghan and Ruth Carden (National Museum of Ireland), Barry McGovern (SAC Inverness) and Julie B  esau, Gill Murray-Dickson and Paul Thompson (University of Aberdeen), GECC and R  seau National Echouages volunteers, Fabien Demaret, Ghislain Doremus, Vincent Ridoux and Olivier Van Canneyt (Pelagis), Sami Hassani (Oc  anopolis), Angela Llavona, Ruth Fernandez (CEMMA) and Paula Mendez-Fernandez (CEMMA and LIENSs), Philippe Verborgh and Ruth Esteban (CIRCE), Joan Gim  nez (EBD-CSIC) and all volunteers involved in sample collection from all the organisations. All samples were taken under the relevant permits. UK samples were collected under the aegis of the UK Cetacean Strandings Investigation Programme, which is funded by Defra and the Devolved Administrations of Scotland and Wales. Data from offshore Irish waters were collected on the Cetaceans on the Frontier cruise thanks to National Marine Research Vessels Ship-Time Grant Aid Programme 2010 funded under the Science Technology and Innovation Programme of National Development Plan 2007-2013. Biopsy samples taken in Ireland were carried out under licence from the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) Nos. C104/2011 and DER/Dolphin2012-10 (licence numbers C111/2013 and C043/2014) and the Health Products Regulatory Authority (licence number: AE19130/P014), with biopsy sampling funded by the NPWS and by a grant to ER from Science Foundation Ireland. Samples from Galicia were obtained with the support of Direcci  n Xeral de Conservaci  n da Natureza-Xunta de Galicia, cofinanced with

European Regional Development Funds (ERDF/FEDER). Southern Spain samples were collected thanks to LIFE ‘Conservación de Cetáceos y tortugas de Murcia y Andalucía’ (LIFE 02 NAT/E/8610). MAS was supported by an FCT postdoctoral grant (SFRH/BPD/29841/2006). Data collection in the Azores was funded by projects TRACE (PTDC/MAR/74071/2006) and MAPCET (M2.1.2/F/012/2011). Funding for sample collection in France and analyses was provided by Fondation Total, Agence de l’Eau Seine-Normandie, Fonds de Dotation pour la Biodiversité, Agence des Aires Marines Protégées, Association Nationale de la Recherche et de la Technologie, Direction Régionale de l’Environnement, de l’Aménagement et du Logement, Ministère de l’Ecologie, du Développement Durable et de l’Energie and Conseil Général de la Manche. ML was supported by a Fyssen post-doctoral fellowship, Fondation Total, a bridge funding from the School of Biology of the University of St Andrews and People’s Trust for Endangered Species. MN was supported by NPWS, the Crawford-Hayes Fund, MASTS (Marine Alliance for Science and Technology for Scotland) and Project FishKosm that is funded by the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine’s Competitive Research Funding programmes. We would also like to thank the editors, Morten Tange Olsen and two unnamed reviewers for helpful comments, which helped improve this manuscript.

References

- Agardy, T., di Sciara, G. N., & Christie, P. (2011). Mind the gap: Addressing the shortcomings of marine protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning. *Marine Policy*, 35(2), 226–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2010.10.006>
- Allen, S. J., Bryant, K. A., Kraus, R. H. S., Loneragan, N. R., Kopps, A. M., Brown, A. M., ... Krützen, M. (2016). Genetic isolation between coastal and fishery-impacted, offshore bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops* spp.) populations. *Molecular Ecology*, 25(12), 2735–2753. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13622>

- 706 Allendorf, F. W., Luikart, G., & Aitken, S. N. (2013). *Conservation and the genetics*
707 *of populations* (2nd ed). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- 708 Anderson, E. C., & Dunham, K. K. (2008). The influence of family groups on
709 inferences made with the program STRUCTURE. *Molecular Ecology*
710 *Resources*, 8(6), 1219–1229. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02355.x)
711 [0998.2008.02355.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02355.x)
- 712 Anon. (2012). Notice of intention to designate The West Connacht Coast SAC (Site
713 code: 002998) as Special Area of Conservation. Department of Arts, Heritage
714 and the Gaeltacht, Ireland.
715 [http://www.nwwac.org/_fileupload/Image/Description_Sites_Marine_SACs_](http://www.nwwac.org/_fileupload/Image/Description_Sites_Marine_SACs_Ireland_Dec2012_EN.pdf)
716 [Ireland_Dec2012_EN.pdf](http://www.nwwac.org/_fileupload/Image/Description_Sites_Marine_SACs_Ireland_Dec2012_EN.pdf) [July 27 2018]
- 717 Berrow, S. (2012). Abundance Estimate of Bottlenose Dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*)
718 in the Lower River Shannon candidate Special Area of Conservation, Ireland.
719 *Aquatic Mammals*, 38(2), 136–144.
720 <https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.38.2.2012.136>
- 721 Bilgmann, K., Möller, L. M., Harcourt, R. G., Kemper, C. M., & Beheregaray, L. B.
722 (2011). The use of carcasses for the analysis of cetacean population genetic
723 structure: a comparative study in two dolphin species. *Plos One*, 6(5),
724 e20103. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020103>
- 725 Cheney, B., Corkrey, R., Durban, J. W., Grellier, K., Hammond, P. S., Islas-
726 Villanueva, V., ... Thompson, P. M. (2014). Long-term trends in the use of a
727 protected area by small cetaceans in relation to changes in population status.
728 *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 2, 118–128.

- 729 Cheney, B., Thompson, P. M., Ingram, S. N., Hammond, P. S., Stevick, P. T.,
730 Durban, J. W., ... Wilson, B. (2013). Integrating multiple data sources to
731 assess the distribution and abundance of bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops*
732 *truncatus* in Scottish waters: Abundance of bottlenose dolphins around
733 Scotland. *Mammal Review*, 43(1), 71–88. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2011.00208.x)
734 2907.2011.00208.x
- 735 Connor, R. C., Wells, R. S., Mann, J., & Read, A. J. (2000). The bottlenose dolphin:
736 social relationships in a fission–fusion society. In J. Mann, R. C. Connor, P.
737 L. Tyack, & H. Whitehead (Eds.), *Cetacean societies: field studies of*
738 *dolphins and whales*. (pp. 91–126). London, United Kingdom: The
739 University of Chicago Press.
- 740 Council of the European Communities (2008). Directive 2008/56/EC of the
741 European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a
742 framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy
743 (Marine Strategy Framework Directive). *Official Journal* (L164), pp. 19-40.
- 744 Durand, E., Chen, E., & Francois, O. (2009). Tess version 2.3 - Reference Manual.
- 745 Englund, A., Ingram, S. N., & Rogan, E. (2008). *An updated population status report*
746 *for bottlenose dolphins using the Lower River Shannon SAC in 2008. Final*
747 *Report to the National Parks and Wildlife Service* (p. 34). University College
748 Cork, Ireland.
- 749 European Commission (Ed.) (2011). *The EU biodiversity strategy to 2020*.
750 Luxembourg: Publ. Off. of the Europ. Union.

- European Economic Community (1992). Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21st May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. *Official Journal* (L206), pp. 7-50.
- Evanno, G., Regnaut, S., & Goudet, J. (2005). Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using the software STRUCTURE: a simulation study. *Molecular Ecology*, 14(8), 2611–2620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02553.x>
- Fernandez, R., Santos, M. B., Pierce, G. J., Llavona, A., Lopez, A., Silva, M. A., ... Piertney, S. B. (2011). Fine-scale genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in Atlantic coastal waters of the Iberian Peninsula. *Hydrobiologia*, 670(1), 111–125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-011-0669-5>
- Foot, A. D., Vijay, N., Ávila-Arcos, M. C., Baird, R. W., Durban, J. W., Fumagalli, M., ... Wolf, J. B. W. (2016). Genome-culture coevolution promotes rapid divergence of killer whale ecotypes. *Nature Communications*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11693>
- Francis, R. M. (2017). pophelper: An R package and web app to analyse and visualise population structure. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 17(1), 27–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12509>
- Funk, W. C., McKay, J. K., Hohenlohe, P. A., & Allendorf, F. W. (2012). Harnessing genomics for delineating conservation units. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 27(9), 489–496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.05.012>
- Gaspari, S., Holcer, D., Mackelworth, P., Fortuna, C., Frantzis, A., Genov, T., ... Ciofi, C. (2015). Population genetic structure of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Adriatic Sea and contiguous regions: implications

- 775 for international conservation. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater*
776 *Ecosystems*, 25(2), 212–222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2415>
- 777 Giménez, J., Louis, M., Barón, E., Ramírez, F., Verborgh, P., Gauffier, P., ... de
778 Stephanis, R. (2018). Towards the identification of ecological management
779 units: A multidisciplinary approach for the effective management of
780 bottlenose dolphins in the southern Iberian Peninsula. *Aquatic Conservation:*
781 *Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 28(1), 205–215.
782 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2814>
- 783 Glaubitz, J. C. (2004). CONVERT: A user-friendly program to reformat diploid
784 genotypic data for commonly used population genetic software packages.
785 *Molecular Ecology Notes*, 4(2), 309–310. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00597.x)
786 8286.2004.00597.x
- 787 Guillot, G., Leblois, R., Coulon, A., & Frantz, A. C. (2009). Statistical methods in
788 spatial genetics. *Molecular Ecology*, 18(23), 4734–4756.
789 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04410.x>
- 790 Hammond, P. S., Bearzi, G., Bjørge, A., Forney, K. A., Karczmarski, L., Kasuya, T.,
791 ... Wilson, B. (2012). *Tursiops truncatus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened
792 Species 2012: e.T22563A17347397.
793 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012.RLTS.T22563A17347397.en>. [21
794 July 2018].
- 795 Hammond, P. S., Macleod, K., Berggren, P., Borchers, D. L., Burt, L., Cañadas, A.,
796 ... Vázquez, J. A. (2013). Cetacean abundance and distribution in European
797 Atlantic shelf waters to inform conservation and management. *Biological*
798 *Conservation*, 64, 107–122.

- 799 Hammond, P. S., Macleod, K., Gillespie, D., Swift, R., Winship, A., Burt, M. L., ...
800 Castro, R. (2009). *Cetacean Offshore Distribution and Abundance in the*
801 *European Atlantic (CODA). Final report to the European Commission.* St
802 Andrews.
- 803 Hartel, E. F., Constantine, R., & Torres, L. G. (2015). Changes in habitat use patterns
804 by bottlenose dolphins over a 10-year period render static management
805 boundaries ineffective: Changes in habitat use render management
806 boundaries ineffective. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater*
807 *Ecosystems*, 25(5), 701–711. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2465>
- 808 Hastings, A. (1993). Complex interactions between dispersal and dynamics - lessons
809 from couple logistic equations. *Ecology*, 74(5), 1362–1372.
810 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1940066>
- 811 Hoelzel, A. R., Potter, C. W., & Best, P. B. (1998). Genetic differentiation between
812 parapatric ‘nearshore’ and ‘offshore’ populations of the bottlenose dolphin.
813 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*,
814 265(1402), 1177–1183.
- 815 Hooker, S. K., & Gerber, L. R. (2004). Marine reserves as a tool for ecosystem-based
816 management: the potential importance of megafauna. *Bioscience*, 54(1), 27–
817 39. Retrieved from <http://bioscience.oxfordjournals.org/content/54/1/27.short>
- 818 Ingram, S. N., Englund, A., & Rogan, E. (2001). *An extensive survey of bottlenose*
819 *dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) on the west coast of Ireland. Heritage Council*
820 *Report no. WLD/2001/42.* (p. 17). University College Cork, Ireland.
- 821 Ingram, S. N., & Rogan, E. (2002). Identifying critical areas and habitat preferences
822 of bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*,

- 823 244, 247–255. Retrieved from [http://www.int-](http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/meps/v244/p247-255/)
- 824 [res.com/abstracts/meps/v244/p247-255/](http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/meps/v244/p247-255/)
- 825 Ingram, S. N., & Rogan, E. (2003). *Bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) in the*
- 826 *Shannon Estuary and selected areas of the west-coast of Ireland. Report to*
- 827 *the National Parks and Wildlife Service* (p. 28). University College Cork,
- 828 Ireland.
- 829 Jakobsson, M., & Rosenberg, N. A. (2007). CLUMPP: a cluster matching and
- 830 permutation program for dealing with label switching and multimodality in
- 831 analysis of population structure. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, 23(14),
- 832 1801–1806. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btm233>
- 833 Jepson, P. D., Deaville, R., Barber, J. L., Aguilar, À., Borrell, A., Murphy, S., ...
- 834 Law, R. J. (2016). PCB pollution continues to impact populations of orcas
- 835 and other dolphins in European waters. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 18573.
- 836 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep18573>
- 837 Jombart, T. (2008). adegenet: a R package for the multivariate analysis of genetic
- 838 markers. *Bioinformatics*, 24, 1403–1405.
- 839 <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btn129>
- 840 Jombart, T. (2012). A tutorial for Discriminant Analysis of Principal Components
- 841 (DAPC) using adegenet 1.3-4.
- 842 Jombart, T., Devillard, S., & Balloux, F. (2010). Discriminant analysis of principal
- 843 components: a new method for the analysis of genetically structured
- 844 populations. *Bmc Genetics*, 11, 94. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2156-11-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2156-11-94)
- 845 94

- 846 Jost, L. (2008). G_{ST} and its relatives do not measure differentiation. *Molecular*
 847 *Ecology*, 17(18), 4015–4026. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03887.x)
 848 294X.2008.03887.x
- 849 Keenan, K., McGinnity, P., Cross, T. F., Crozier, W. W., & Prodöhl, P. A. (2013).
 850 diveRsity : An R package for the estimation and exploration of population
 851 genetics parameters and their associated errors. *Methods in Ecology and*
 852 *Evolution*, 4(8), 782–788. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12067>
- 853 Kelleher, G., & Phillips, A. (Eds.). (1999). *Guidelines For Marine Protected Areas*.
 854 IUCN Publications Services Unit, 219c Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3
 855 ODL, United Kingdom: IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
 856 <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.1999.PAG.3.en>
- 857 Kopps, A. M., Ackermann, C. Y., Sherwin, W. B., Allen, S. J., Bejder, L., &
 858 Krutzen, M. (2014). Cultural transmission of tool use combined with habitat
 859 specializations leads to fine-scale genetic structure in bottlenose dolphins.
 860 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1782),
 861 20133245–20133245. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.3245>
- 862 Lacy, R. C. (1987). Loss of Genetic Diversity from Managed Populations:
 863 Interacting Effects of Drift, Mutation, Immigration, Selection, and Population
 864 Subdivision. *Conservation Biology*, 1(2), 143–158.
 865 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.1987.tb00023.x>
- 866 Louis, M., Fontaine, M. C., Spitz, J., Schlund, E., Dabin, W., Deaville, R., ... Simon-
 867 Bouhet, B. (2014). Ecological opportunities and specializations shaped
 868 genetic divergence in a highly mobile marine top predator. *Proceedings of the*
 869 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1795), 20141558–20141558.
 870 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.1558>

- 871 Louis, M., Gally, F., Barbraud, C., Béreau, J., Tixier, P., Simon-Bouhet, B., ...
872 Guinet, C. (2015). Social structure and abundance of coastal bottlenose
873 dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in the Normano-Breton Gulf, English Channel.
874 *Journal of Mammalogy*, gyv053. Retrieved from
875 <http://jmmammal.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/04/30/jmmammal.gyv053.abstract>
876 3.abstract
- 877 Louis, M., Viricel, A., Lucas, T., Peltier, H., Alfonsi, E., Berrow, S., ... Simon-
878 Bouhet, B. (2014). Habitat-driven population structure of bottlenose dolphins,
879 *Tursiops truncatus*, in the North-East Atlantic. *Molecular Ecology*, 23(4),
880 857–874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12653>
- 881 Lusseau, D., Bain, D., Williams, R., & Smith, J. (2009). Vessel traffic disrupts the
882 foraging behavior of southern resident killer whales *Orcinus orca*.
883 *Endangered Species Research*, 6, 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00154>
- 884 Meissner, A. M., Christiansen, F., Martinez, E., Pawley, M. D. M., Orams, M. B., &
885 Stockin, K. A. (2015). Behavioural Effects of Tourism on Oceanic Common
886 Dolphins, *Delphinus sp.*, in New Zealand: The Effects of Markov Analysis
887 Variations and Current Tour Operator Compliance with Regulations. *PLOS*
888 *ONE*, 10(1), e0116962. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116962>
- 889 Mirimin, L., Miller, R., Dillane, E., Berrow, S. D., Ingram, S., Cross, T. F., & Rogan,
890 E. (2011). Fine-scale population genetic structuring of bottlenose dolphins in
891 Irish coastal waters: Population genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins.
892 *Animal Conservation*, 14(4), 342–353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2010.00432.x>
893 1795.2010.00432.x

- 894 Moritz, C. (1994). Defining evolutionarily significant units for conservation. *Trends*
 895 *in Ecology & Evolution*, 9(10), 373–375. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(94)90057-4)
 896 5347(94)90057-4
- 897 Natoli, A., Peddemors, V. M., & Hoelzel, A. R. (2003). Population structure and
 898 speciation in the genus *Tursiops* based on microsatellite and mitochondrial
 899 DNA analyses: Bottlenose dolphin population genetics. *Journal of*
 900 *Evolutionary Biology*, 17(2), 363–375. [https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2003.00672.x)
 901 9101.2003.00672.x
- 902 Nichols, C., Herman, J., Gaggiotti, O. E., Dobney, K. M., Parsons, K., & Hoelzel, A.
 903 R. (2007). Genetic isolation of a now extinct population of bottlenose
 904 dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
 905 *Sciences*, 274(1618), 1611–1616. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.0176>
- 906 Nykänen, M. (2016). *Phylogeography, population structure, abundance and habitat*
 907 *use of bottlenose dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, on the west coast of Ireland*.
 908 University College Cork, Cork. Retrieved from
 909 <https://cora.ucc.ie/handle/10468/3828>
- 910 Nykänen, M., Dillane, E., Englund, A., Foote, A. D., Ingram, S. N., Louis, M., ...
 911 Rogan, E. (2018). Quantifying dispersal between marine protected areas by a
 912 highly mobile species, the bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*. *Ecology*
 913 *and Evolution*, 8(18), 9241–9258. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4343>
- 914 O'Brien, J., Berrow, S., Ryan, C., McGrath, D., O'Connor, I., Giovanna, P., ...
 915 Whooley, P. (2009). A note on long-distance matches of bottlenose dolphins
 916 (*Tursiops truncatus*) around the Irish coast using photo-identification.
 917 *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, 11(1), 71–76. Retrieved
 918 from <https://cual.openrepository.com/cual/handle/10759/347018>

- 919 Ó Cadhla, O., & Marnell, F. (Eds.) (2017). Proceedings of the Transnational
 920 Bottlenose Dolphin Conservation Workshop hosted in Dublin, 7-8 December
 921 2016. National Parks & Wildlife Service, Department of Arts, Heritage,
 922 Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs, Dublin, Ireland. 391pp.
- 923 Olsen, M. T., Andersen, L. W., Dietz, R., Teilmann, J., Harkonen, T., & Siegismund,
 924 H. R. (2014). Integrating genetic data and population viability analyses for
 925 the identification of harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) populations and
 926 management units. *Molecular Ecology*, 23(4), 815–831.
 927 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12644>
- 928 Palsbøll, P. J., Berube, M., & Allendorf, F. W. (2007). Identification of management
 929 units using population genetic data. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22(1),
 930 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.09.003>
- 931 Peltier, H., Dabin, W., Daniel, P., Van Canneyt, O., Dorémus, G., Huon, M., &
 932 Ridoux, V. (2012). The significance of stranding data as indicators of
 933 cetacean populations at sea: Modelling the drift of cetacean carcasses.
 934 *Ecological Indicators*, 18, 278–290.
 935 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.11.014>
- 936 Pesante, G., Evans, P. G. H., Baines, M. E., & McMath, M. (2008). *Abundance and*
 937 *life history parameters of bottlenose dolphin in Cardigan Bay: monitoring*
 938 *2005-2007. CCW Marine Monitoring Report.*
- 939 Pirotta, E., Merchant, N. D., Thompson, P. M., Barton, T. R., & Lusseau, D. (2015).
 940 Quantifying the effect of boat disturbance on bottlenose dolphin foraging
 941 activity. *Biological Conservation*, 181, 82–89.
 942 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.003>

- 943 Pritchard, J. K., Stephens, M., & Donnelly, P. (2000). Inference of population
944 structure using multilocus genotype data. *Genetics*, 155(2), 945–959.
- 945 Queller, D. C., & Goodnight, K. F. (1989). Estimating relatedness using genetic
946 markers. *Evolution*, 43(2), 258–275. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2409206>
- 947 Quérrouil, S., Silva, M. A., Freitas, L., Prieto, R., Magalhães, S., Dinis, A., ... Santos,
948 R. S. (2007). High gene flow in oceanic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops*
949 *truncatus*) of the North Atlantic. *Conservation Genetics*, 8(6), 1405–1419.
950 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-007-9291-5>
- 951 Quick, N. J., Cheney, B., Islas-Villanueva, V., Janik, V. M., Thompson, P. M., &
952 Hammond, P. S. (2014). *The east coast of Scotland bottlenose dolphin*
953 *population: Improving understanding of ecology outside the Moray Firth*
954 *SAC. Report produced as part of the UK Department of Energy and Climate*
955 *Change's offshore energy Strategic Environmental Assessment programme*
956 (OESEA2 Supporting documents No. 14D-086) (p. 87). Department of
957 Energy and Climate Change. Retrieved from
958 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/346326/OESEA2_east_coast_of_Scotland_bottlenose_dolphin_population.](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/346326/OESEA2_east_coast_of_Scotland_bottlenose_dolphin_population.pdf)
959 [pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/346326/OESEA2_east_coast_of_Scotland_bottlenose_dolphin_population.pdf)
- 960
- 961 Rambaut, A., & Drummond, A. J. (2007). Tracer v1.4, Available from
962 <http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Tracer>.
- 963 Rannala, B. (2013). *BayesAss Edition 3.0 User's Manual*. University of California
964 Davis.
- 965 Raymond, M., & Rousset, F. (1995). GENEPOP (version 1.2) - Population genetics
966 software for exact tests and ecumenicism. *Journal of Heredity*, 86(3), 248–
967 249.

- 968 R Core Team (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
 969 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
 970 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/).
- 971 Reif, J., Schaefer, A., Bossart, G., & Fair, P. (2017). Health and Environmental Risk
 972 Assessment Project for bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* from the
 973 southeastern USA. II. Environmental aspects. *Diseases of Aquatic*
 974 *Organisms*, 125(2), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.3354/dao03143>
- 975 Robinson, K. P., O'Brien, J., Berrow, S., Cheney, B., Costa, M., Elsfield, S. M., ...
 976 Whooley, P. (2012). Discrete or not so discrete: Long distance movements by
 977 coastal bottlenose dolphins in UK and Irish waters. *Journal of Cetacean*
 978 *Research and Management*, 12(3), 365–371. Retrieved from
 979 <http://cual.openrepository.com/cual/handle/10759/560746>
- 980 Rogan, E., Gkarakouni, M., Nykänen, M., Whitaker, A., & Ingram, S. N. (2018).
 981 *Bottlenose dolphin survey in the Lower River Shannon SAC 2018. Report to*
 982 *the National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Arts, Heritage,*
 983 *Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs* (p. 22). Cork: University College
 984 Cork.
- 985 Rosel, P. E., Hansen, L., & Hohn, A. A. (2009). Restricted dispersal in a
 986 continuously distributed marine species: common bottlenose dolphins
 987 *Tursiops truncatus* in coastal waters of the western North Atlantic. *Molecular*
 988 *Ecology*, 18(24), 5030–5045. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04413.x)
 989 [294X.2009.04413.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04413.x)

990 Rousset, F. (2008). GENEPOP'007: a complete re-implementation of the GENEPOP
991 software for Windows and Linux. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 8(1), 103–
992 106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2007.01931.x>

993 Van Oosterhout, C., Hutchinson, W. F., Wills, D. P. M., & Shipley, P. (2004).
994 MICRO-CHECKER: software for identifying and correcting genotyping
995 errors in microsatellite data. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, 4(3), 535–538.
996 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00684.x>

997 Vollmer, N. L., & Rosel, P. E. (2017). Fine-scale population structure of common
998 bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in offshore and coastal waters of the
999 US Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Biology*, 164(8). [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-017-3186-x)
1000 017-3186-x

1001 Wang, J. (2011). coancestry: a program for simulating, estimating and analysing
1002 relatedness and inbreeding coefficients: COMPUTER PROGRAM NOTE.
1003 *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 11(1), 141–145.
1004 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2010.02885.x>

1005 Waples, R. S., & Gaggiotti, O. (2006). What is a population? An empirical
1006 evaluation of some genetic methods for identifying the number of gene pools
1007 and their degree of connectivity. *Molecular Ecology*, 15(6), 1419–1439.
1008 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2006.02890.x>

1009 Weir, B. S., & Cockerham, C. C. (1984). Estimating *F*-statistics for the analysis of
1010 population structure. *Evolution*, 38(6), 1358–1370.
1011 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2408641>

1012 Whitehead, H. (2017). Gene–culture coevolution in whales and dolphins.
1013 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(30), 7814–7821.
1014 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1620736114>

- 1
2
3 1015 Williams, R., Bain, D., Smith, J., & Lusseau, D. (2009). Effects of vessels on
4
5 1016 behaviour patterns of individual southern resident killer whales *Orcinus orca*.
6
7 1017 *Endangered Species Research*, 6, 199–209. <https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00150>
8
9
10 1018 Wilson, B. (2016). Might marine protected areas for mobile megafauna suit their
11
12 1019 proponents more than the animals?: MPAs for megafauna or people? *Aquatic*
13
14 1020 *Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 26(1), 3–8.
15
16
17 1021 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2619>
18
19 1022 Wilson, G. A., & Rannala, B. (2003). Bayesian inference of recent migration rates
20
21 1023 using multilocus genotypes. *Genetics*, 163(3), 1177–1191.
22
23
24 1024
25
26 1025
27
28 1026
29
30 1027
31
32 1028
33
34 1029
35
36 1030
37
38 1031
39
40 1032
41
42 1033
43
44 1034
45
46 1035
47
48 1036
49
50 1037
51
52 1038
53
54 1039
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1040 **Tables**
4
5 1041
6
7
8 1042 Table 1. Pairwise fixation indices based on 14 microsatellite loci (given as average
9 1043 with 95% Highest Probability Density Interval (HPDI)) between the different
10 1044 populations. The samples were divided into populations based on results from TESS.
11 1045 Values above the diagonal are F_{ST} -values and values below the diagonal are Jost's D
12 1046 values.

	Shanno n	Wales/W est Scotland	East Scotlan d	West Ireland	English Channel	Galicia	Gibralta r/Cadiz	Pelagic Atlantic
		0.136	0.164	0.129	0.090	0.226	0.232	0.227
Shannon	-	(0.096- 0.180)	(0.130- 0.200)	(0.104- 0.153)	(0.079- 0.103)	(0.178- 0.283)	(0.215- 0.249)	(0.212- 0.241)
Wales/W est Scotland	0.090 (0.061- 0.121)	-	0.066 (0.037- 0.103)	0.128 (0.092- 0.169)	0.082 (0.058- 0.111)	0.125 (0.083- 0.176)	0.173 (0.154- 0.197)	0.178 (0.159- 0.198)
East Scotland	0.141 (0.104- 0.176)	0.036 (0.010- 0.075)	-	0.149 (0.119- 0.183)	0.090 (0.067- 0.114)	0.091 (0.062- 0.131)	0.150 (0.129- 0.172)	0.164 (0.147- 0.183)
West Ireland	0.074 (0.056- 0.095)	0.089 (0.064- 0.116)	0.115 (0.086- 0.148)	-	0.115 (0.099- 0.131)	0.178 (0.132- 0.234)	0.208 (0.190- 0.227)	0.190 (0.177- 0.206)
English Channel	0.065 (0.052- 0.079)	0.082 (0.054- 0.115)	0.081 (0.054- 0.110)	0.104 (0.085- 0.125)	-	0.094 (0.065- 0.134)	0.134 (0.122- 0.146)	0.146 (0.136- 0.157)
Galicia	0.174 (0.123- 0.234)	0.098 (0.042- 0.164)	0.054 (0.027- 0.090)	0.111 (0.067- 0.164)	0.093 (0.060- 0.142)	-	0.140 (0.115- 0.173)	0.139 (0.116- 0.170)
Gibraltar /Cadiz	0.386 (0.346- 0.426)	0.289 (0.246- 0.331)	0.260 (0.220- 0.310)	0.347 (0.308- 0.388)	0.286 (0.254- 0.320)	0.259 (0.214- 0.312)	-	0.034 (0.026- 0.043)
Pelagic Atlantic	0.457 (0.423- 0.492)	0.359 (0.318- 0.398)	0.345 (0.310- 0.384)	0.379 (0.347- 0.414)	0.351 (0.324- 0.377)	0.335 (0.281- 0.401)	0.097 (0.072- 0.126)	-

Table 2. Nuclear diversities over all loci for each population inferred by TESS.

Population	N (mean)	A	%	AR	H_o	H_e	HWE	F_{IS}	F_{IS} Low	F_{IS} High	PA
Shannon	52	52	31.19	3.06	0.44	0.42	0.997	-0.0604*	-0.1215	-0.0014	0
Wales/West Scotland	20	57	35.86	3.36	0.46	0.48	0.839	0.0362	-0.0744	0.1386	1
East Scotland	31	54	35.94	3.42	0.52	0.54	0.982	0.0297	-0.0565	0.1067	1
West Ireland	36	53	34.82	3.30	0.51	0.47	1.000	-0.0754*	-0.1358	-0.0204	0
English Channel	111	93	57.45	4.75	0.60	0.60	0.971	0.0115	-0.0244	0.0470	2
Galicia	13	58	36.90	3.76	0.60	0.55	0.419	-0.0892*	-0.2011	-0.0046	0
Gibraltar/Cadiz	49	113	72.10	6.10	0.73	0.74	0.463	0.0141	-0.0172	0.0462	2
Pelagic Atlantic	106	148	92.43	7.07	0.75	0.77	0.998	0.0266	0.0030	0.0497	26

N=mean number of individuals used for each locus, A=number of alleles observed, %=percentage of total alleles, AR=allelic richness, H_o =observed heterozygosity, H_e =expected heterozygosity, are given as per locus per population sample. Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE)=corrected p-values (chi-square test for goodness-of-fit), F_{IS} = F_{IS} values for each loci and population sample (overall), F_{IS} Low/High=bias corrected 0.025% and 92.5% percentiles of the confidence interval. *denotes significance in F_{IS} values as the 95% CI does not overlap zero, PA=number of Private Alleles.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1055 Table 3. Mean (and 95% Credible Interval) recent migration rates inferred using BayesAss. The migration rate is defined as the proportion of
1056 individuals in a population that immigrated from a source population per generation. Migration rates above 0.10 have been highlighted in bold.
1057

Population \ Source	Shannon	Wales/West Scotland	East Scotland	West Ireland	English Channel	Galicia	Gibraltar/Cadiz
Shannon	0.959 (0.931 - 0.987)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.016)	0.007 (0.000 - 0.019)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.016)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.016)
Wales/West-Scotland	0.012 (0.000 - 0.036)	0.678 (0.657 - 0.700)	0.257 (0.206 - 0.307)	0.010 (0.000 - 0.029)	0.013 (0.000 - 0.037)	0.010 (0.000 - 0.029)	0.010 (0.000 - 0.029)
East Scotland	0.010 (0.000 - 0.030)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.025)	0.935 (0.892 - 0.978)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.027)	0.011 (0.000 - 0.030)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.025)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.026)
West Ireland	0.054 (0.000 - 0.112)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.028)	0.898 (0.833 - 0.964)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.024)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)
English Channel	0.008 (0.000 - 0.021)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.008)	0.007 (0.000 - 0.019)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.013)	0.969 (0.948 - 0.990)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.008)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.008)
Galicia	0.015 (0.000 - 0.043)	0.014 (0.000 - 0.041)	0.181 (0.104 - 0.257)	0.015 (0.000 - 0.043)	0.062 (0.000 - 0.127)	0.684 (0.652 - 0.716)	0.014 (0.000 - 0.041)
Gibraltar/Cadiz	0.006 (0.000 - 0.017)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.017)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.017)	0.941 (0.902 - 0.981)
Pelagic Atlantic	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.004 (0.000 - 0.011)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)

Figure legends

Figure 1. Map of samples used in the study and their origin; stranding - samples collected from stranded bottlenose dolphins, biopsy - samples collected from skin biopsies, and catalogued – samples collected from stranded animals that had been matched to a photo-identification catalogue of known coastal dolphins. The grey contours represent 200m and 1000m depth contours.

Figure 2. Map of individual assignment probabilities per population identified by TESS using the whole dataset ($N=425$) and $K=6$. The color scale bar indicates the assignment probabilities, (a) East and West Scotland, Wales and Galicia, (b) West Ireland, (c) Shannon estuary, Ireland, (d) English Channel, France, (e) pelagic Atlantic, (f) Gibraltar-Cadiz.

Figure 3. Results of TESS analyses involving only coastal samples. A) Map of individual assignment probabilities per population using all coastal samples ($N=269$) and $K=5$: (a) East Scotland and Wales (b) West Ireland, (c) Shannon estuary, Ireland, (d) English Channel, France, (e) Galicia, Spain. (B) Map of individual assignment probabilities per population using only the samples from coastal Wales, West and East Scotland ($N=53$) and $K=2$: (a) West Scotland and Wales (b) East Scotland. The color scale bar indicates the assignment probabilities.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1065

For Peer Review






Figure 1. Map of samples used in the study and their origin; stranding - samples collected from stranded bottlenose dolphins, biopsy - samples collected from skin biopsies, and catalogued - samples collected from stranded animals that had been matched to a photo-identification catalogue of known coastal dolphins. The grey contours represent 200m and 1000m depth contours.

208x181mm (300 x 300 DPI)



A) Coastal samples - $K = 5$ B) Wales and all Scotland coastal samples - $K = 2$ 